

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for reconsideration and withdrawal of the finality of the previous Office Action and of the rejection over Braudaway et al. in view of Patten et al. Review and reconsideration of the application in view of Applicants' remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 24- 28, 30-32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,530,759 to Braudaway et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,901,224 to Hecht. Claims 7 and 33 also are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Braudaway et al. in view of Hecht as applied to claim 8 above. Claims 12, 17, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Braudaway et al. in view of Hecht, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,563,542 to Hatakenaka et al. Applicants traverse each of the rejections for at least the following reasons.

As admitted by the Patent Office, the primary reference of Braudaway et al. does not teach determining an optimum location for the human visible information based on a spatial analysis of the image, nor that the human readable information is not obtrusive. Hatakenaka et al. also does not teach, disclose, or suggest an optimum location for the human visible information based on a spatial analysis of the image, nor that the human readable information is not obtrusive.

Hecht discloses placing both machine readable and human readable information in a document. See, for example, col. 6, lines 43-48; col. 7, lines 1-2; col. 8, lines 16-21; and col. 9, lines 26-31. The machine readable information is in the form of glyphs inserted at desirable locations such that the addition or change in data is not observable to the human eye (see, for example, col. 6, lines 15-18 and 43-48; and col. 7, lines 8-12). The hiding of glyphs is further described in US Pat. 5,444,779 to Daniele, cited by the Patent Office but not applied, and cited in Hecht at col. 3, lines 33-47. Daniele states at col. 7, lines 25-30, that: "An important characteristic of the two-dimensional or self-clocking glyph code... is that it is not readily discernible to the person attempting to make an unauthorized copy..." Thus, Hecht discloses addition of non-human readable information and human readable

information to a document. There is no disclosure or suggestion of adding human readable information that is **not obtrusive**.

Hecht does not overcome the deficiencies of Braudaway et al., or of Braudaway et al. in view of Hatakenaka et al., because Hecht does not teach, disclose, or suggest that the human readable information is not obtrusive. For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are in order, and are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit all pending claims are in condition for allowance for at least the above reasons. Reconsideration and prompt action in the form of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner require anything further, or have any questions, the Examiner is asked to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,



Kathleen Neuner Manne
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 40,101

KNM:kjw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 722-9225
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.